

Moving from Managing Organizations to Creating Social Enterprises: Entrepreneurial Social Work and Advanced Generalist Education

Kenneth M. Flanagan, Ph.D., LICSW

Department of Social Work, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND 58202-7135, USA

Received
May 6, 2014

Accepted
September 2, 2014

Published
November 11, 2014

Citation: Flanagan, Kenneth M. (2014). Moving from managing organizations to creating social enterprises: Entrepreneurial social work and advanced generalist education. *The Advanced Generalist: Social Work Research Journal*, 1(2), p 1-14.

Abstract

This article highlights the concept of social entrepreneurship and its relevance for advanced generalist macro social work education and practice. Macro practice courses that address organizations have traditionally focused on management, administration, and organizational leadership skill development. This article identifies some of the concepts and skills associated with social entrepreneurship and how incorporating a social entrepreneurship perspective into these courses can enrich advanced generalist organizational course content at the graduate level. By incorporating an entrepreneurship perspective, the opportunity exists for the creation of new social enterprises or the enhancement of existing agencies. The author discusses challenges and opportunities associated with redesigning a course curriculum using a social entrepreneurship perspective while being sensitive to the Educational Policy Accreditation Standards (CSWE, 2008), the Network for Social Work Management Human Services Management Competencies, and the National Content Standards for Entrepreneurship Education. The inclusion of social entrepreneurship content into advanced generalist education programs can provide practitioners opportunities for creating social enterprises geared towards promoting social change.

Keywords: Social entrepreneurship, social enterprises, social innovation, advanced generalist social work practice

Copyright Kenneth M. Flanagan. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 3.0 (CC-BY-NC-ND) which permits you to copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format. You must give [appropriate credit](#).

Introduction

The perception that social entrepreneurship emerged out of the business field sometimes causes it to be shunned by social workers; however, the history of social work provides numerous examples of individuals who exhibited characteristics associated with social entrepreneurs (Glicken, 2011). This article explores the development of social entrepreneurship and highlights some of the concepts and skills associated with it. The early leaders of the profession of social work developed organizations and interventions reflective of what we now refer to as social enterprises (Daynes & Longo, 2004). However, over time the profession moved away from some of these innovative approaches as our organizations and agencies became increasingly bureaucratic and lost this innovative edge (Payne, 2000; Pruger, 1962). The innovative approaches of the early years of our history engaged both the macro level and the micro level of social work intervention, and eventually led to the development of social work's person-in-environment perspective.

This person-in-environment perspective is the foundational premise of social work (Kemp, Whittaker, & Tracy, 1997), and necessitates the integration of the macro and micro levels for us to realize our full professional identity. Advanced generalist social work practice is based upon this person-in-environment perspective, integrating the macro and micro levels of practice. The advanced generalist approach provides students enrolled in these programs the opportunity to embrace this integration, and a range of practice approaches is needed for this integration to happen. The generalist practitioner needs to have a range of skills to fulfill the multiple tasks associated with their practice (Gibbs, Locke, & Lohmann, 1990). Thus students need a degree of expertise at both the micro and macro levels, especially in rural communities and smaller social service agencies where generalist practitioners will be involved with multiple roles such as a case manager, counselor, supervisor, organizer, and innovator (Ginsberg, 2011). An entrepreneurial approach promotes advanced generalist practice as it is focused on responding to needs in the here and now and not rigidly separating macro and micro interventions. Using this approach, the micro and macro become part of a continuous continuum rather than segmented and divided approaches.

With the advent of social entrepreneurship as a movement for social change (Steyaert & Hjorth, 2008), social work can bring its particular expertise to it. Engaging with the entrepreneurial movement can lead to the creation of new or the renewal of existing social organizations and services to meet the needs of communities (Bornstein, 2007). Yet social work as a profession has not embraced social entrepreneurship or social enterprises during the past few decades. A number of reasons have been given for this reluctance, including a level of discomfort with business practices, a perceived incongruence with social work values, and ambivalence about engaging with fiscal concerns (Bent-Goodley, 2002; Harris, Sapienza, & Bowie, 2009). The reality, however, is that because of decreased funding and the resultant increase in competition for available dollars there is a need for an innovative entrepreneurial mindset among social workers (Jaskyte, 2004), which is also true with micro practice where we cannot afford to continue social work practices that have not shown efficacy.

It is hoped that by highlighting how social work has promoted an entrepreneurial spirit in its early years, social work students, practitioners, and educators will engage with social entrepreneurship and become social innovators and agents of social change, which is core to our professional mission. This article highlights how social entrepreneurship and the creation of social enterprises can be incorporated into advanced generalist practice courses. The new generation of social work students appears open to a more entrepreneurial approach to social service delivery and would thereby benefit from this content inclusion into advanced generalist curriculum. The article begins with an introduction to social entrepreneurship and then presents its relevance for advanced generalist social work education and practice.

Social Entrepreneurship

Although the term and concepts associated with entrepreneurship are often perceived as new, they actually date back more than 200 years. The first time the concept of entrepreneurship was encountered was around 1800 when Jean Baptiste Say, an economist, used it to describe economic activity that was geared towards economic development and the opportunity to create wealth (Dees & Economy, 2001). He was followed by the economist Schumpeter (1934), who expanded upon the concept of

entrepreneurship and promoted the idea that the entrepreneur was a change agent in society (Dees & Economy, 2001). Thus entrepreneurship, which has a link to the field of economics, embodies a positive attitude towards change, openness to creative approaches, and an emphasis on freedom (Clark & Lee, 2006). These traits seem to be hallmarks of an entrepreneurial spirit.

The present emergence of social entrepreneurship is viewed as having begun around 1981, although the term did not come into vogue until the early 1990s. In 1980, Bill Drayton founded Ashoka, which was established to promote innovators of change. It was during the early 1980s that clusters of individuals came together around these notions of social enterprises and social innovation (Fulton & Dees, 2006).

At that time social entrepreneurship was seen as an outgrowth of the field of business and was focused on applying business principles to solve larger social issues, particularly in developing nations. One of the first well-known successes using a social entrepreneurship approach was the Grameen Bank, which was launched in 1984 by Muhammod Yunus in Bangladesh. This bank has as its purpose “to help the world’s poor people to reach their full potential.” This bank initially lent money to individuals, many of them women, in numerous countries throughout the world to allow them to expand their small home-based businesses. This approach has led to the increased use of micro-financing to promote economic development (Yunus, 2007). This is only one of many examples of how social entrepreneurship is being used to improve the quality of life for people.

Although the concept of entrepreneurship has been around for more than 30 years, entrepreneurship continues to face a challenge in terms of coming to an accepted definition. Some attempts have been made to establish a definition by leaders in the field. The Skoll Foundation on their website, for example, defines social entrepreneurship as “change agents for society, seizing opportunities others miss and improving systems, inventing new approaches, and creating sustainable solutions to change society for the better.”

Social entrepreneurship is often linked with efforts promoting societal transformation (Alvord, Brown, & Letts, 2004). A social entrepreneur is defined by Light (2006) as “an individual, group, network, organization, or alliance of organizations that seek sustainable, large-scale change through pattern-breaking ideas

in what or how governments, nonprofits, and businesses do to address significant social problems” (p. 50).

Martin & Osberg (2007) define a social entrepreneur as

... someone who targets an unfortunate but stable equilibrium that causes the neglect, marginalization, or suffering of a segment of humanity; who brings to bear on this situation his or her inspiration, direct action, creativity, courage, and fortitude; and who aims for and ultimately affects the establishment of a new stable equilibrium that secures permanent benefit for the targeted group and society at large. (p. 34-35)

Social entrepreneurship and the social entrepreneur are focused on resolving the social issues that lead to disparity within societies. The definitions that are currently emerging within the field of entrepreneurship move beyond the historical focus on the individual entrepreneur to a focus on how the larger community can experience entrepreneurship (Light, 2006). Compared with the earlier years when individuals were highlighted, the emphasis is now on how organizations and communities are collectively working toward implementing social innovation through the creation of social enterprises. This opens a door for the profession of social work, which has always been more focused on collective action, to more proactively engage with social entrepreneurship approaches and opportunities. Historically, our person-in-environment perspective has allowed us to engage with communities and organizations as part of our repertoire of interventions. This is an area of expertise we bring to the entrepreneurial enterprise.

These definitions and attributes of social entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurs appear strikingly similar to what is viewed as attributes of social work and social workers. The National Association of Social Workers states in the preamble of the Code of Ethics (NASW, 2008) that

The primary mission of the social work profession is to enhance human well-being and help meet the basic human needs of all people, with particular attention to the needs and empowerment of people who are vulnerable, oppressed, and living in poverty. A historic and defining feature of social work is the profession's focus on individual well-being in a social context and the well-being of society. Fundamental to social work is

attention to the environmental forces that create, contribute to, and address problems in living. (p. 1)

According to the Code, social workers

Promote social justice and social change with and on behalf of clients.

“Clients” is used inclusively to refer to individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers are sensitive to cultural and ethnic diversity and strive to end discrimination, oppression, poverty, and other forms of social injustice. (p. 1)

Given the similarities between social work and social entrepreneurship, the question is how we might work together to achieve a vision of a socially and economically just world.

Social Work and Social Innovation

One might think that entrepreneurship is a new concept in relation to social work practice, but in reality the profession from its early days has exhibited an entrepreneurial spirit. Jane Addams, an early leader in social work, embraced an entrepreneurial spirit and displayed the attributes commonly associated with social entrepreneurship (Lundblad, 1995). She not only worked with those in need, she also lived with them and immersed herself in the lives of those she served. Her community and organizational initiatives were the basis for the development of settlement houses and other innovative social agencies throughout the country. When students are presented with Jane Addams’ story, they are impressed and inspired by her approach. The students see in her an example of a person who broke out of the professionalism that can limit our interactions with clients. Although none of them see themselves, at least at this time, doing what Jane Addams did, they are challenged and desire to exemplify her ideals and her life in their work. They are inspired by the risk taking, vision, and persistence of her example. These qualities are the mark of social entrepreneurs (Byers, Kist, & Sutton, 1997).

Another early social worker who provides an example of the entrepreneurial spirit was Ida Cannon. Ms. Cannon is rather well known to those involved with medical social work, but not so much outside of that field. Ms. Cannon was one of the first social

workers and an early director of social services at Massachusetts General Hospital. She was hired to improve the medical care by responding to the more psychosocial needs of patients (Bartlett, 1975). This led to the development of approaches to care that were innovative and responsive to patient needs and addressed environmental concerns in addition to medical concerns.

In addition to individuals who displayed the entrepreneurial spirit, the profession itself has traditionally sought out innovative and creative opportunities to better the lives of others and promote justice (Hiersteiner & Peterson, 1999). Social work has been at the forefront of developing services and organizations responding to the needs of children, families, those coping with mental health issues, grief and loss, and a whole range of issues. These individuals and situations are reflective of entrepreneurship past and present within the profession of social work, and we need to expose students to this entrepreneurial history.

Social workers have traditionally been advocates for those left out by society. This is embodied in our Code of Ethics and the very definition of our profession, as stated above. Social work has historically been at the forefront in the development of programs, services, and the management of organizations that had as its mission the betterment of people's lives. Thus our entrepreneurial efforts have been used to bring about a more inclusive and empowering future for those we serve. Over time, however, the field, including those involved with social work management, became invested in a task and skills orientation and sometimes lost the vision of the purpose of our social agencies.

As Felice Perlmutter stated in an interview in 2007 with *Social Work Today*:

The value of having someone with a social work degree is the orientation to clients and services, but that isn't even happening. I was struck by research by Donna Hardina, PhD, for the network that found that social workers at the top of their organization aren't empowering their staff or clients to participate in any of the decision making. We have this rhetoric about empowerment and participatory decision making, but we don't practice it. We use it as a mantra. For years, we have been in self-denial and infatuated with these words. (Jones, 2007, p. 22)

We appear to have strayed from our historical roots when it comes to management. It is important to know how to recapture entrepreneurial concepts and strategies into coursework, particularly at the macro level.

The roots of the profession seem tied to the entrepreneurial spirit. How might we recapture this entrepreneurial spirit? A key strategy may be to engage with a generation of students who appear more open to an entrepreneurial approach.

The Entrepreneurship Generation

The millennial generation, those individuals born between 1977 and 1997, comprises a significant number of students in higher education and those currently pursuing professional social work degrees. This generation displays characteristics that are consistent with an entrepreneurial spirit and approach. A *Small Business Trends* article by Lesonsky (2013) highlighted that the majority of millennials surveyed have an entrepreneurial mindset when it comes to risk taking, vision, being self-starters, and being sensitive to opportunities. This same article stated that more than half of millennials who responded to a survey self-identified as entrepreneurs. A number of factors contribute to this phenomenon. Some reflect societal trends, such as the downsizing of corporations and institutions in response to economic turbulence resulting in less confidence and trust in others to provide stability in employment situations (Wennekers & Thurik, 1999). The introduction of technology and social media has transformed our economic structures. Some of the characteristics of the work environment in the past are no longer present, leading to less reliance on companies and institutions for socialization, income, and growth.

At a personal level, the value of freedom has led to seeking opportunities that allow for flexibility and more of a balance between work and social life. Thus this generation tends to see entrepreneurship as a means to an end—the chance to have freedom, set their own schedules and paths, and integrate professional and personal interests. Women have been attracted to entrepreneurship as a career option. It is estimated that nearly half of entrepreneurs are women. In a blog by Natalie MacNeil that appeared in *Forbes*, she wrote that entrepreneurship is the new women's movement. She states that entrepreneurial businesses and organizations are providing

women opportunities that allow them to do business in a way that embodies their values and approaches.

The millennial generation is also interested in “doing good” (Howe & Strauss, 2009). They tend to value social worth over money and wish to use their resources and lives to improve the quality of life for others (Greenberg, 2008). Social work can provide the opportunity for them to have a professional identity that fulfills these desires. It has been the author’s experience that consistent with their peers they wish to do this work their way rather than rely on our professional history and structures. This new generation of social workers will not be bound by the sometimes rigid and bureaucratic structures that some of us who are older have tried to maneuver through (Thompson, 2011). These students seem primed for providing social work services through the creation of new structures and social enterprises to meet human needs. Promoting entrepreneurial approaches particularly at the macro level of practice can be a way to engage this younger generation in the work of justice within society. The incorporation of curriculum content into advanced generalist practice programs can provide the foundation for the entrepreneurial perspective and promote creative out-of-the-box thinking that is needed to address complex social issues, such as poverty, that face our society.

Teaching Entrepreneurship

In recent decades there has been a significant increase in the number of programs in higher education that teach entrepreneurship. Currently more than 2,000 colleges and universities offer coursework in entrepreneurship, many leading to undergraduate and graduate degrees (Ransom, 2013). These programs are growing and attracting socially conscious students who wish to combine their idealism of helping others with approaches that are derived from the management sciences. These students could potentially enroll in social work programs and choose social work as a professional career, along with our currently enrolled students, if we committed to incorporating an entrepreneurial approach in our macro course, particularly those courses focused upon organizational management. How might this incorporation occur?

In social work we have significant experience teaching organizational management and practice both at the undergraduate and graduate levels of social work

education. An important aspect of our social work management courses is the teaching of skills, addressing areas such as managing boards, executive leadership, financial and human resources management, development and fundraising, and community collaboration (Edwards & Yankey, 1991). Included is an emphasis on ethical managerial practice.

Incorporating an entrepreneurial approach does not mean abandoning the teaching of these skills but rather incorporating attitudes needed to encourage entrepreneurship. For example, the author's organization course begins with showing a clip from a video titled "Being Fearless: Exploring the Practices of Social Changemaking," which is on the Independent Sector website. This video presents five attitudes derived from the Case Foundation's "Be Fearless" campaign that promote social innovation. These attitudes are make big bets and make history, experiment early and often, make failure matter, reach beyond your bubble, and let urgency conquer fear. The students comment most on the "making failure matter" attitude. They find that reframing failure frees them to be creative and innovative as they launch their professional careers. The students do not view this as a license to not be thoughtful and critical but rather takes away the fear that inhibits them from trying something new. The profession of social work would not be where it is if our predecessors operated from fear. These attitudes are similar to five distinctive features of entrepreneurship—seek opportunities, be creative, implement thoughtfully, seek out resources, and finally, take risks to make things happen (Fargion, Gevorgianiene, & Lievens, 2011). The promotion of these attitudes early in the course can begin to encourage a willingness to take the risk of engaging in socially innovative practices.

When designing the course it is important to be sensitive to the various standards that ensure a quality of education for students. These standards include the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (CSWE, 2008), Network for Social Work Management Human Services Management Competencies (NSWM, 2013), and the Content Standards for Entrepreneurial Education (CEE, 2004). These standards can provide guidance when developing course outlines. There is intersectionality between the standards of these three organizations, as diagrammed in Table 1.

Table 1. Listing of Competencies & Standards

Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (CSWE)	Human Services Management Competencies (NSWM)	National Content Standards for Entrepreneurial Education (CEE)
<p>Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly</p> <p>Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice</p> <p>Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments</p> <p>Engage diversity and difference in practice</p> <p>Advance human rights and social and economic justice</p> <p>Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research</p> <p>Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment</p> <p>Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services</p> <p>Respond to contexts that shape practice</p> <p>Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities</p>	<p>Establishes, promotes, and anchors the vision, philosophy, goals, objectives, and values of the organization</p> <p>Possess interpersonal skills that support the viability and positive functioning of the organization</p> <p>Possesses analytical and critical thinking skills that promote organizational growth</p> <p>Models appropriate professional behavior and encourages other staff members to act in a professional manner</p> <p>Manages diversity and cross-cultural understanding</p> <p>Develops and manages both internal and external stakeholder relationships</p> <p>Initiates and facilitates innovative change processes</p> <p>Advocates for public policy change and social justice at national, state, and local levels</p> <p>Demonstrates effective interpersonal and communication skills</p>	<p>Entrepreneurial Processes: Understands concepts and processes associated with successful entrepreneurial performance</p> <p>Entrepreneurial Traits/Behaviors: Understands the personal traits/behaviors associated with successful entrepreneurial performance</p> <p>Business Foundations: Understands fundamental business concepts that affect business decision making</p> <p>Communications and Interpersonal skills: Understands concepts, strategies, and systems needed to interact effectively with others</p> <p>Digital Skills: Understands concepts and procedures needed for basic computer operations</p> <p>Economics: Understands the economic principles and concepts fundamental to entrepreneurship/small-business ownership</p> <p>Financial Literacy: Understands personal money-management concepts, procedures, and strategies</p> <p>Professional Development: Understands concepts and strategies needed for career exploration, development, and growth</p> <p>Financial Management: Understands the financial concepts and tools used in making business decisions</p> <p>Human Resource Management: Understands the concepts, systems, and strategies needed to acquire, motivate, develop, and terminate staff</p> <p>Information Management: Understands the concepts, systems, and tools needed to</p>

		<p>access, process, maintain, evaluate, and disseminate information for business decision-making</p> <p>Marketing Management: Understands the concepts, processes, and systems needed to determine and satisfy customer needs/wants/expectations, meet business goals/objectives, and create new product/service ideas</p> <p>Operations Management: Understands the processes and systems implemented to facilitate daily business operations</p> <p>Risk Management: Understands the concepts, strategies, and systems that business implement and enforce to minimize loss</p> <p>Strategic Management: Understands the processes, strategies, and systems needed to guide the overall business organization</p>
--	--	---

The competencies and standards from these three groups can be brought into the course design process. As our primary competencies and practice behaviors are those from the Council on Social Work Education and provide the framework for the course, the competencies from the Social Work Management Human Services Management Competencies and the National Content Standards for Entrepreneurial Education can be reviewed and incorporated to create alignment with the EPAS competencies. For example, the author incorporates EPAS 10(a) for this advanced generalist practice organization course, which includes the practice behavior of “use of empathy and other interpersonal words.” This aligns with the Network for Social Work for Social Work Management Human Services Competency 2, which states “Possesses interpersonal skills that support the viability and positive functioning of the organization with its corresponding performance indicators.” These align with the Content Standards for Entrepreneurship Education regarding communication and interpersonal skills. Using this process allows us to broaden our engagement with the managerial and entrepreneurial communities and can also allow for a broader repertoire of competencies and behaviors to be incorporated into the course.

The author also used a framework developed by Fayolle & Gailly (2008) to further develop and design the course. Fayolle & Gailly highlight the need for entrepreneurial education to incorporate an ontological level in addition to an educational level. Incorporating the ontological level allows for reflection upon what education means in the context of entrepreneurship and what are the respective roles of the educator and participants when incorporating an entrepreneurial approach. This is followed by outlining the course at the education level. The framework developed by Favolle & Gailly that was used to guide the development of the author's organization course has the instructor identify the target audience for the course, whether the student population is primarily undergraduates, graduate students, or a mix. Depending on the educational level of the students, the structure of the course may differ. For example, the approach will be different for undergraduates who most likely do not have much, if any, business background.

Some emerging research suggests that prior business and entrepreneurial exposure affects educational approaches (Fayolle & Klandt, 2006). Thus, for those courses that are geared towards graduate students, there is more likely to be experiential exposure that would allow the course to bypass some of the foundational concepts and approaches. The research conducted by Basu & Virick (2008) suggests that familial variables can affect entrepreneurial education, such as having a father who was self-employed increases the chances of that student being more open to entrepreneurship. Thus, the more one can have an understanding of the audience, the better able one can decide on appropriate course designs.

After identifying the target audience, there is the "why" or objectives of the course. Those of us in social work education rely on the EPAS competencies to develop the objectives of the course. In this particular course EPAS competencies regarding ethical practice, critical thinking, responding to context and engaging, assessing, intervening, and evaluating were chosen as the primary competencies. This selection was then followed by delineation of the desired results, which were the identified practice behaviors aligned with each of the competencies. The "what" box is where the course content, such as introducing the entrepreneurial perspective, theories of nonprofit management, board relationships, finance, were outlined and the "how" were

the methods or pedagogies used in the course, such as case studies, lectures, media, and assignments.

Upon completing the framework, the author chose a text that allowed for the development of lectures, discussion, and exploration of case studies focused on the traditional aspects of organizational management along with providing an introduction to social entrepreneurship. Supplemental reading was used to enhance the entrepreneurial approach.

Lessons Learned

As the result of going forward with this approach of integrating an entrepreneurial perspective with the traditional focus on the development of managerial skills in an advanced generalist practice organizational course, a few lessons learned can be shared.

Focus on Integrating Entrepreneurial Attitudes into the Content Area

The author has come to understand that entrepreneurship does not negate the need to have a firm theoretical foundation and exposure to managerial skill development. Rather, it is more of an attitude. It involves the incorporation of encouraging students to take risks, have vision, and think of issues in a way that lends itself to the development of innovative approaches. The use of the various competencies and standards provides a wide range of options for integrating entrepreneurial attitudes with theory and skill development. It does not require an instructor to entirely redesign a current course; rather, updating course content to incorporate entrepreneurial attitudes is what is needed.

Focus on Experiential Learning

Integrating entrepreneurial attitudes requires a focus on experiential learning. The experiential approach seems synonymous with entrepreneurial education. Some of the feedback that the author received from students was the desire for even more experiential opportunities than had been planned originally. The students seemed to benefit from the small group activities they were involved with during the course of the semester. Providing an opportunity for students to share with one another within the

context of smaller groups proved to be a key way for the students to develop ideas, test out possibilities, and refine strategies. The author intends to build more time into the class schedule to further facilitate the use of small groups. A capstone assignment of the course is the development of a business plan for the creation of an organization that they would one day consider developing. This assignment provides students with the opportunity to apply course content to the experience of creating your own organization.

Focus on Letting Go of Expectations to Allow for Creativity to Thrive

A hallmark attribute of entrepreneurship education is the emphasis on creativity as part of the learning experience. As a matter of fact, creativity leads to innovative approaches. This has been the most challenging aspect of entrepreneurship education. The author had been schooled in the traditional lecture and activity mode of education and allowing myself to be creative and experiment has been hard. The students when provided the opportunity seem more open to this process than the instructor is. One lesson the author has learned is that to be an entrepreneur means to “let go” in order to have the creative and innovative entrepreneurial spirit flourish. As Timmons (1989) has pointed out, entrepreneurship is about the journey, rather than an exclusive focus on the destination.

Conclusions

The social entrepreneurship movement and the development of social enterprises as vehicles for promoting social change are likely to continue to be a force for the foreseeable future. The profession of social work can benefit from engaging with this movement and bringing its historical and current expertise to it. As has been highlighted in this article, providing course content regarding social entrepreneurship and how it can lead to the development of social enterprises can be a way to engage with future leaders within the profession around social entrepreneurship. The current generation of social work students appears open and willing to engage and would benefit from exposure to the expertise of the field. It is hoped that this article has provided a basis for promoting this content into existing curriculum.

For this to happen it is useful to recall the work of Schumpeter, who in 1934 developed a model for entrepreneurship, consisting of five key elements. Three of these five elements have relevance for those who teach in advanced generalist practice programs and who desire to promote an entrepreneurial spirit. These three elements are motivation, innovation, and overcoming resistance. Faculty members need to tap into their students' motivational abilities, promote innovative thinking, and assist with the development of strategies that can decrease resistance to change. Social work can then join with other fields to realize our profession's ideal of creating a just society.

References

- Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., & Letts, C. W. (2004). Social entrepreneurship and societal transformation: An exploratory study. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 40(3), 260–282.
- Bartlett, H. M. (1975). Ida M. Cannon: Pioneer in medical social work. *The Social Service Review*, 49(2), 208–229.
- Basu, A., & Virick, M. (2008, March). *Assessing entrepreneurial intentions amongst students: A comparative study*. The 12th Annual Meeting of the National Collegiate Inventors and Innovators Alliance. Dallas, TX.
- Bent-Goodley, T. B. (2002). Defining and conceptualizing social work entrepreneurship. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 38(2), 291–302.
- Byers, T., Kist, H., & Sutton, R. I. (1997). Characteristics of the entrepreneur: Social creatures, not solo heroes. In R.C. Doff (Ed.), *The handbook of technology management*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Bornstein, D. (2007). *How to change the world: Social entrepreneurs and the power of new ideas*. New York, NY: Oxford University.
- Clark, J. R., & Lee, D. R. (2006). Freedom, entrepreneurship and economic progress. *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 15(1), 1–17.
- Consortium for Entrepreneurship Education. (2004). *National content standards for entrepreneurship education*. Columbus, OH: Author.
- Council on Social Work Education. (2008). *Educational policy and accreditation standards*. Washington, DC; Author.
- Daynes, G., & Longo, N. V. (2004). Jane Addams and the origins of service-learning practice in the United States. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 11(1), 5–13.
- Dees, J. G., & Economy, P. (2001). Social entrepreneurship. *Enterprising nonprofits: A toolkit for social entrepreneurs*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Edwards, R. L., & Yankey, J. A. (1991). *Skills for effective human services management*. Washington, DC: National Association of Social Workers Press.

- Fargion, S., Gevorgianiene, V., & Lievens, P. (2011). Developing entrepreneurship in social work through international education. Reflections on a European intensive programme. *Social Work Education, 30*(8), 964–980.
- Fayolle, A., & Gailly, B. (2008). From craft to science: Teaching models and learning processes in entrepreneurship education. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 32*(7), 569–593.
- Fayolle, A., & Klandt, H. (Eds.). (2006). *International entrepreneurship education: Issues and newness*. Chetelham UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Fulton, K., & Dees, G. (2006). *The past, present, and future of social entrepreneurship. A conversation with Greg Dees*. Pre-reading for Gathering of Leaders, Case, Duke University's Fuqua School of Business. Available at <http://www.caseatduke.org/documents/deesinterview.pdf>
- Gibbs, P., Locke, B. L., & Lohmann, R. (1990). Paradigm for the generalist-advanced generalist continuum. *Journal of Social Work Education, 26*(3), 232–243.
- Ginsberg, L. H. (2011). *Social work in rural communities*. Washington, DC: Council on Social Work Education.
- Glicken, M. D. (2011). *Social work in the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Greenberg, E. (2008). *Generation we: How millennial youth are taking over America and changing our world forever*. Cusco, Peru: Pachatusan.
- Harris, J. D., Sapienza, H. J., & Bowie, N. E. (2009). Ethics and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing, 24*(5), 407–418.
- Hiersteiner, C., & Peterson, K. J. (1999). “Crafting a usable past”: The care-centered practice narrative in social work. *Affilia, 14*(2), 144–161.
- Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2009). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. New York, NY: Random House LLC.
- Independent Sector. (2013, June, 6). *Being fearless: Exploring the practices of social changemaking*. [webinar]. Retrieved from https://www.independentsector.org/webinar_ngen_being_fearless
- Jaskyte, K. (2004). Transformational leadership, organizational culture, and innovativeness in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 15*(2), 153–168.
- Jones, L. K., (2007). The future of social work administration: An interview with Felice D. Perlmutter. *Social Work Today, 7*(4), 22.
- Kemp, S. P., Whittaker, J. K., & Tracy, E. M. (1997). *Person-environment practice: The social ecology of interpersonal helping*. New York, NY: Transaction Publishers.
- Lesonsky, R. (2013, May). Millennials are rewriting the rules of work and entrepreneurship. *Small Business Trends*. [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://smallbiztrends.com/2013/05/millennials-work-and-entrepreneurship.html>
- Light, P. C. (2006). Reshaping social entrepreneurship. *Stanford Social Innovation Review, 4*(3), 47-51.
- Lundblad, K. S. (1995). Jane Addams and social reform: A role model for the 1990s. *Social Work, 40*(5), 661–669.

- MacNeil, N. (2012, June 8). *Entrepreneurship is the new women's movement*. [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/work-in-progress/2012/06/08/entrepreneurship-is-the-new-womens-movement/>
- Martin, R. L., & Osberg, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: The case for definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 5(2), 28–39.
- National Association of Social Workers. (2008). *Code of ethics of the National Association of Social Workers*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse.
- Network for Social Work Management. (2013). *Human services competencies*. Retrieved from <https://socialworkmanager.org/competencies/>
- Payne, M. (2000). *Anti-bureaucratic social work*. New York, NY: Venture Press.
- Pruger, R. (1962). The good bureaucrat. *Social Case Journal*, 1–7.
- Ransom, D. (2013, January 2). The rise of entrepreneurship on college campuses. *Entrepreneur*. Retrieved from <http://www.entrepreneur.com/article/225359#>
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle* (Vol. 55). New Brunswick, NJ; London, UK: Transaction Publishers.
- Skoll Foundation (2104). Retrieved from: <http://skollworldforum.org/about/what-is-social-entrepreneurship/>
- Steyaert, C., & Hjorth, D. (Eds.). (2008). *Entrepreneurship as social change: A third movements in entrepreneurship book*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Thompson, N. W. (2011). *Managing the millennials: Employee retention strategies for Generation Y*. CMC Senior Theses. Paper 240. Claremont McKenna College. Available at http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cmc_theses/.
- Timmons, J. A. (1989). *The entrepreneurial mind*. Andover, MA: Brickhouse Publishing.
- Wennekers, S., & Thurik, R. (1999). Linking entrepreneurship and economic growth. *Small Business Economics*, 13(1), 27–56.
- Yunus, M. (2007). *Creating a world without poverty: Social business and the future of capitalism*. New York, NY: Public Affairs.

About the Author

Kenneth Flanagan is currently an Assistant Professor of Social Work at the University of North Dakota. He has 30 years of professional social work experience. Prior to his present position he held numerous administrative and clinical positions in the health and human services field. His areas of research interests are spirituality and practice, organizational leadership, and gerontology. He received his Ph.D. from The Ohio State University.